

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

MEETING MINUTES

SEPTEMBER 19, 2013

AGENDA

- 1. Lochslee at Muirfield – Entry Feature**
13-092AFDP
(Approved 7-0)
Arran Court & Tain Drive
Amended Final Development Plan
- 2. NE Quad – Subarea 4C – Estates of Scioto Crossing – Patio and Deck Features**
13-093AFDP
(Approved 7-0)
Scioto Crossing Boulevard
Amended Final Development Plan
- 3. Bridge Street District – Code Modification**
13-095ADM
Administrative Request

Chair Chris Amorose Groomes called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were Warren Fishman, Joe Budde, Amy Kramb, John Hardt, Richard Taylor, and Victoria Newell. City representatives were Steve Langworthy, Gary Gunderman, Tammy Noble-Flading, Dan Phillabaum, Rachel Ray, Justin Goodwin, Jennifer Readler, and Libby Farley.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Taylor moved to accept the documents into the record as presented. Mr. Hardt seconded. The vote was as follows Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; and Mr. Taylor. (Ms. Newell, not yet present.) (Approved 6 – 0.)

Motion and Vote

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were corrections needed for the August 22, 2013 meeting minutes.

Mr. Hardt directed everyone to the last paragraph of Page 4, and said it should read "existing signs included, common masonry elements". Then in the second sentence, it should read, "He said a proposal that incorporates all three signs..."

Ms. Kramb referred to Page 9, fifth paragraph and said it should read "she believes these are valid concerns".

Mr. Hardt referred to Page 5, second paragraph, and stated it should read "that the applicant should be cautious..." He asked the tape be reviewed because he felt something was missing from Page 6, paragraph 8. He said paragraph 8 is replaced by: "Ms. Childers confirmed that the original developer will retain control of the balance of the site. She said they have a contract on the next area west if they are able to proceed. She said this will depend on the future use of the rest of the property." He said Page 10, paragraph 10, third sentence should read "He stated that the plans show a walkout basement."

Motion and Vote

Mr. Fishman moved to approve the August 22, 2013 meeting minutes as amended. Ms. Kramb seconded. The vote was as follows: Ms. Newell, abstain; Mr. Budde, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Mr. Taylor, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; and Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes. (Approved 6 – 0 – 1.)

Ms. Amorose Groomes determined the order of the cases heard would be as published. She briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission.

**1. Lochslee at Muirfield – Entry Feature
13-092AFDP**

**Arran Court & Tain Drive
Amended Final Development Plan**

Ms. Amorose Groomes said a presentation was not warranted since the application was on the consent agenda. She asked if there was anyone in the audience who would like to speak in respect to this application. [There were none.]

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor moved, Mr. Fishman seconded, to approve this Amended Final Development Plan because it complies with the review criteria and the existing development standards, with two conditions:

1. That the applicant submit a survey showing the proposed entry feature sign outside of the sanitary sewer easement, or that the sign be field located by a surveyor outside of the easement subject to approval by the City Engineer; and
2. That the lighting be fully screened by the landscaping in front of the sign.

Ms. Kathy Faust agreed to the conditions.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Amorose Groomes; yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0.)

**2. NE Quad – Subarea 4C – Estates of Scioto Crossing – Patio and Deck Features
13-093AFDP**

**Scioto Crossing Boulevard
Amended Final Development Plan**

Ms. Kramb asked about the lot coverage. Ms. Noble-Flading indicated the proposed changes were well within the lot coverage given the minor modifications.

Ms. Kramb said the patio look as though they can extend further out than previously approved along the western property line. Ms. Noble-Flading stated with the proposed condition, the maximum depth would be 24 feet, where 18 feet is currently permitted.

Ms. Kramb confirmed the proposed included two rectangular areas; one rectangle for the sunroom and one rectangle for the patio. Ms. Noble-Flading agreed.

Ms. Kramb confirmed if a homeowner builds in both area they can fill in all of the additional space to 24 feet. Ms. Noble-Flading agreed.

Ms. Kramb indicated the houses appear close together and they are built to up to the setback line along the park. Mr. Langworthy said the Code permits condominium development to build up the setback line.

Ms. Kramb commented there would be no yard space.

Mr. Hardt summarized if every home owner took the maximum option the patio area for the entire development would be 12,720 square feet; which would amount to 2%.

Ms. Newell asked about the lot between 1B and 2B, along Essex Gate Drive. She said the plans note a clearance of 10' 6", but that dimension is noted to the prior deck outline. She said there appears to be only a few feet clearance between the proposed new extension and the adjoining deck.

Randall Woodings (Kontogiannis Architects, 400 S. Fifth Street, Suite 400, Columbus, Ohio) said Lot 1 was the model and the outdoor area was existing and minimal changes were anticipated.

Ms. Kramb added she would like to see a minimum distance between the patios. Mr. Woodings indicated the houses were not fee simple properties, but condominiums.

Ms. Kramb asked if there is a side lot line. Mr. Woodings stated there are no lot lines, because it is a condominium development.

Ms. Kramb said that she would like to see the minimum building separation continue with the patios at 10 foot 6 inches. She said the patio size could increase, but it needed to meet the same building separation established for the houses.

Ms. Newell said this would allow some simple flexibility between one condominium and another condominium, depending on the choices that are made and the design of the deck that is put in place.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there was anyone from the general public who would like to speak with respect to this application.

Mr. Jeff Davies (7846 Avaleen Circle, Dublin, Ohio) said he was one of the first ones to build a patio and his was approved at 18 foot by 18 foot. He said his patio does not extend passed his morning room; however, that is how he originally wanted it. He confirmed the condition would not impact what he currently has constructed with his condominium.

Motion and Vote

Victoria Newell moved, John Hardt seconded, to approve this Amended Final Development Plan because it complies with the review criteria and the existing development standards, with two conditions:

- 1) Units 6-8 and 20-22 be permitted to increase the depth of the patio and deck area to within 1-foot of the setback along the western property line, not to exceed a maximum of 24 feet in depth; and
- 2) That the existing approved minimum separation between units applies to all proposed outdoor amenities.

Mr. Woodings agreed.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Taylor, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 7 – 0.)

Communications

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she appreciated the mails from staff regarding the President's Cup information and confirmed everyone's issues had been resolved.

3. Bridge Street District – Code Modification 13-095ADM

Administrative Request

Ms. Amorose Groomes introduced Case 3 and confirmed the Commissioners received the February 2, 2012 version to review. She stated Mr. Hardt had indicated the process issues were resolved in the February version. She asked Mr. Goodwin if he had any additional follow-up.

Mr. Goodwin said the February version resolves a number of the issues noted in the email. He said Planning would like to discussion some different ways to accomplish the same goal. He said 153.066 may

have a better flow if the two review tracks are separated once a development plan and a site plan are submitted. He said if an applicant is on the Planning Commission track it would make the process clearer then it would be as previously drafted, but it wouldn't change the intent of what was previously reviewed.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if the technical issues listed for the Commissioners were still outstanding. Mr. Goodwin said yes. He noted the version provided by Planning via email was similar to the February version, but with slightly different language, specifically in regards to the third criterion. He said the criterion has now been directly linked to the scope or number of waivers, whereas before it was worded more generally in terms of the appropriateness of the proposal.

Mr. Hardt stated subsection 3 sent by Mr. Goodwin was consistent with what he was looking for and he thought accomplished what the Commission wanted. He said subsection 1 moves the review and determinations into the public realm, which he felt was important. He said it allows for compromise in that both options of either Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) or Administrative Review Team (ART) review exist and can be applied as appropriate on a case by case basis rather than a one size fits all solution. He said the ART process is appropriate for certain cases, such as simple projects or straightforward applications where it is appropriate to have a quick review for a potential applicant. He said there are also complex projects that require conversation in the public setting. Mr. Hardt stated he thought it best not to try to make the distinction between those types of cases at this point, but he found the proposed process allows for variations of gray going forward and goes a long way towards meeting the Commission's goals.

Ms. Newell said she concurs the public review process is important. She said she respects staff and appreciates the intent of the Code, but she said she fears with larger projects that are taken out of the public realm the opportunity for one particular individual to have the ultimate authority of what happens. She said then this can be used against the applicant. She said our residents should have a say in how our community develops.

Mr. Budde asked what Planning's position on the proposed amendments. He asked whether it was workable and made sense. Mr. Goodwin said Planning finds the proposal workable with the additional revisions noted in his email.

Mr. Goodwin said one specific point to look at are the timeframes associated with project reviews. He said if a case were to go through the PZC track additional review time will be necessary, which could add two weeks to ensure initial ART review and recommendation to the Commission. He said a significant amount of staff review happens behind the scenes and we need to maintain the same level of staff review before an application is presented to the Commission. He said public notice time has to be taken into account as well.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if he had those timelines generated. Mr. Goodwin said Planning had discussed extending the review times from 28 days to 42 days, to allow for the two week public notice. He said timeframe would allow for the 28 days currently established through the ART review process to gain a recommendation and then would allow for the public notice requirements for the Planning and Zoning Commission agenda.

Ms. Kramb asked if the notice could occur half way through the 28 days or at the end of the 28 days. Mr. Goodwin replied it would be at the end of the 28 days.

Mr. Hardt asked if the Planning and Zoning Commission date should be established when an applicant is submitted for ART review. Mr. Goodwin said they could determine a meeting date at 42 days out, if the applicant was amenable, but if for any reasons through the review the entire 28 day ART review was not necessary, it could get complicated.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked what happened if there was a problem identified during the review process or certain documents were not provided or updated in the timeframes. Mr. Goodwin said a time extension would be necessary at the applicant's request.

Ms. Kramb said the revised version included the option for additional Planning and Zoning Commission meetings. She asked how those additional meetings are established. Mr. Langworthy said the Code provision states the Commission will establish extra meetings as necessary to meet the time deadlines, but it would take action by the Commission.

Ms. Kramb added she wouldn't want to delay the review process because we have to wait to vote to schedule a special meeting. Mr. Langworthy agreed and said that was a concern raised by Planning because there are many factors and details that have to happen in this specific time period. He said these unforeseen circumstances are the reason for the extended timeframe. He said we may not need all 42 days, and often the ART doesn't need the full 28 days, but the proposed timeframe gives extra cushion to make sure we can meet all the notice and review deadlines.

Mr. Hardt said Planning provided examples from other communities and he noted Grandview and the Columbus Downtown Commission both only meet once a month. He said if we are comparing ourselves to what other communities are able to do, we are already ahead of them.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said we have nearly committed to weekly meetings, if necessary.

Mr. Fishman commented he was happy Planning was open to the proposed amendments and noted that staff has the education and skill to complete the reviews. He said the Commission's request is not because we lack faith in them, but the idea that more eyes to review a project was better. He said they received an email from Mr. Taylor with a different concept on moving Riverside Drive, which was an example of looking at an idea with fresh eyes regardless of the outcome.

Ms. Kramb said she compared the February 2, 2012 version to the revised version provided by Planning and she noted the three criteria for the kick-up provision remain, but she found one is the same, but two and three are slightly different. She asked for clarification about these changes.

Mr. Goodwin said their concern with the previous language was that an application could include a building or use that is permitted within the zoning district, but the criterion could be used to determine that it was not appropriate even though it was already permitted by Code. He said this could be problematic and Planning thought that switching the language to focus on waivers, which are essentially deviations from the Code, would be more objective.

Ms. Kramb said she liked the proposed changes because it seemed to fit better.

Mr. Taylor said the proposed version is more concise and addressed the items the Commission wanted, and he suggested it be reviewed line by line. Mr. Goodwin agreed.

Mr. Taylor stated he provided a two-page modification to Ms. Readler for her review. He said his intent was to provide future Commissions members the background of the Bridge Street District. He said the modifications provide a big picture of the intent behind the regulations.

Mr. Langworthy said he did not want to confuse the approval process with the review track determination process. He asked if Mr. Taylor intended for the proposed language to state "all of the following criteria" have to be met or only some.

Mr. Taylor said he did not intend for this to be an exhaustive list. He said the intent was to include a larger context for review, because with the Edwards Project the Commission had frustration about only seeing the immediate environs of the building. He said he would like to build a map or a series of maps

that would start with a figure-ground drawing, which includes everything existing and everything that is planned. He said an example of this could include streets. He said as every project comes forward we would keep adding to it to see how it fits in the larger context to make sure all the pieces fit together.

Mr. Hardt said we currently do not see the whole project in context.

Mr. Taylor said the second two things on the list would be to make sure we see beyond the existing buildings within a certain number of blocks to make sure we understand how these pieces fit together.

Mr. Langworthy said he understood the intent and suggested Planning work on minor revisions to Mr. Taylor's proposed language.

Mr. Hardt agreed with Mr. Taylor in principal, but said it is difficult when reviewing a single site within the Bridge Street District and not understanding the overall context. He said within the Bridge Street District, all pieces are supposed to be linked together and he said that would be helpful information to have during the review. He said he would like to find a way that we could see the context, even if it is provided in a conceptual nature.

Mr. Langworthy agreed and said we have also expressed frustration with the lack of an overall Master Plan for this last project and not knowing what was intended beyond the immediate area. Ms. Amorose Groomes said even the applicant was unable to tell us what is planned adjacent to the site.

Mr. Langworthy said there will be some circumstances where we would have a better idea of how that may happen, but there will be others when we won't know. He said there are plans that are sometimes shown to staff, but we don't get to keep. He said Planning heard the Commission's concern about the contextual aspect of it and has talked about it at some length. He said in some respects it is unfortunate this project had to be the first one because we were not able to show much context. He said he hoped in the future that would be different.

Ms. Newell asked if the applicant presented more to Planning than what was provided to the Commission, because the applicant made a comment during the review about the proposal being very different than what they originally showed. She said she wondered if staff was left with the same dilemma as the Commission and not knowing what was to come forward in the future.

Mr. Langworthy said the issue lies with the type of applicant submitting an application. He said we have some who want to do something different that we would not accept, others who ask what we want them to do, and others who do not have a specific interest. He said anyone of those applicants could change their minds midway through the meeting, as the discussion goes on. He said it is difficult to deal with those applicants. He said we would sooner deal with an applicant who absolutely knows what they want or absolutely don't want, than an applicant who does not care.

Mr. Hardt stated it was important for the Commission to understand what the City wants and that there may be a compromise in the middle. Mr. Langworthy agreed.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said there seems to be general support of the Commission of the proposed language provided by Mr. Goodwin. She said she does not want to wait until the entire Code has been reviewed before taking it to City Council. She said wants to get Council's temperature on the review process first, because what is decided in the subsequent chapters of the Code is dependent on the review and approval procedures. She said she would like to wrap up 153.066 and provide it to Council. She said then we can finish the balance of the sections.

Ms. Kramb asked about the status of the applicant guide discussed as part of the original Code adoption process.

Mr. Goodwin stated as part of this process we will incorporate our observations and ideas of items that could be better explained or clarified within an applicant guide. He said Planning has reviewed the current Code and identified material that should be incorporated into the guide and as they proceed through the Code sections, they would like to have that conversation with the Commission. Mr. Goodwin said there would be separate sections within one applicant guide, with the exception of the *Historic District Design Guidelines* that will happen separately.

Ms. Kramb asked if this was consultant driven. Mr. Goodwin said it is being developed at staff level with the potential for graphics provided by a consultant.

Ms. Kramb asked about the timing for completing the guide. Mr. Goodwin answered it depended on how quickly the Code is reviewed and impact of the changes proposed.

Mr. Hardt asked about submittal requirements and whether there was a checklist for Bridge Street District application. Mr. Goodwin said yes, the application requirements are available online and Planning could send the link.

Mr. Hardt said Mr. Taylor's request could be potential submittal requirements that an applicant provides with an application. He said he did not prefer these requirements to be provided in the Code, because they change and evolve with more experience. He said an addition to the submission requirement may be helpful. Ms. Amorose Groomes agreed.

Mr. Hardt asked if that could be provided in the applicant guide or with the application.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said maybe those are questions need to be addressed by the applicant when submitting the application. Mr. Goodwin said that was an option. He said a compromise approach could be to make the intent of the review clearer in the Code.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if the Commissioners felt the February 2012 version with the clarifications made by Mr. Goodwin were getting close to a draft they could recommend for approval.

Ms. Kramb asked if a draft could be ready for the September 26th meeting. Mr. Goodwin indicated that would not provide Planning with enough time to revise the language and have it ready for a packet that would need to be delivered tomorrow.

Ms. Amorose Groomes indicated the October 10th meeting would be the next available date.

Mr. Hardt confirmed with Ms. Amorose Groomes the intent was to leave tonight's meeting with enough input to have a final draft ready for review.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she felt the Commission and Planning seem to be on the same page throughout these discussions and the language distributed by Mr. Goodwin is getting close.

Mr. Fishman said Mr. Goodwin indicated a draft would not be ready by the 26th and asked if the special meeting scheduled for September 26th should be cancelled. Mr. Goodwin said we could proceed with reviewing the other Codes sections, or finalize 153.066 first.

Ms. Kramb confirmed the packet would be distributed on October 4th for the October 10th meeting. She stated the information could be provided in Dropbox and then the Commission could review it prior to the meeting and provide comments to Planning to respond.

Ms. Readler indicated the Commissioners could submit comments to Planning, but she cautioned the group about exchanging emails back and forth about the topic outside of the meeting.

Ms. Kramb asked if the Commissioners commented would Planning have enough time to make changes and redistribute the revisions prior to the meeting. She said she would like to have more time to see any additional revisions without having to see it and vote on it in the same day.

Ms. Newell asked if the Commissioners are making an unreasonable request of Planning in terms of the amount time to revise and distribute the material. Mr. Goodwin responded it would be helpful to make sure an adequate amount of time is dedicated for the review, because we want to ensure we do not rush it and miss something in the process. He said Planning also needs to review the remaining sections of the Code to ensure we are not creating other issues with the proposed revisions.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said if packets are distributed on the 4th we would have an entire week. Mr. Goodwin said they could meet that timeframe.

Ms. Kramb confirmed the review would be for the October 10th meeting.

Mr. Fishman said that would eliminate the September 26th meeting. Mr. Hardt said unless we want to talk about other sections of the Code on the 26th.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said we need to decide that tonight.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if the Commission wanted to start another section before we finish 153.066. She said the Commission had identified different sections to address. Ms. Kramb indicated site development, street types, and building types were on the list.

Ms. Amorose Groomes and Mr. Goodwin indicated site development standards were next.

Ms. Kramb said the biggest item to discuss within this section is the sign provisions.

Mr. Goodwin indicated that Planning found it helpful to hear the Commissioners' concerns and discussion regarding a particular section. He said it provided an opportunity to consider their discussion along with the items Planning has identified during their review.

Mr. Hardt asked if the Commissioners should have a roundtable discussion to highlight the items they have concerns. Mr. Goodwin said yes.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if the Commissioners wanted to do that next week at the September 26th meeting or save it for the October 10th meeting.

Mr. Hardt said he was willing to come to any meeting, but he was not sure if having a special meeting just for a roundtable feels like a good use of time.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that aside from their regular meeting business on the 10th, they will review a fully developed 153.066 and then be prepared for a roundtable discussion on 153.065 regarding site development standards. She confirmed everyone agreed and that there would be no meeting on September 26th.

Mr. Budde commended Mr. Taylor for the memo he provided, especially about the review procedure that would include additional background and context. He said that was currently missing and he was privileged yesterday to attend a presentation by the president of Columbus State Community College, where he discussed a 50-year master plan. He said it was well done and informative and the plan looked at a large area and plugged in the various pieces of the puzzle to form the grand vision. He said it was informative and he said if the Commission could have had something similar with the Edwards project it

would have made a huge difference in the conversation. He said it would have cut time that was spent on unnecessary things because we just didn't understand the context. He said he appreciated Mr. Taylor's effort to include this.

Mr. Taylor thanked Mr. Budde for his comment. He said based on his prior experience with this group, he is certain everyone involved is going to see this approach gives more certainty at a very early stage of project and eliminate the big issues later.

Mr. Taylor stated the Heartland project looks fantastic and the building has made so much progress so quickly. He said this was the first building built to Bridge Street standards and people were concerned about it being located close to the road, but it has been detailed out and developed well. He said it is a nice building.

Mr. Goodwin asked the Commission to make a motion to cancel the September 26th meeting.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Hardt moved, seconded by Ms. Kramb, to cancel the September 26th Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. The vote was as follows: Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Taylor, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; and Mr. Hardt, yes. (Approved 7 – 0.)

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked for any other communications for the Commissioners.

Mr. Langworthy asked Mr. Taylor to send Planning a copy of his memo.

Mr. Hardt said he had a couple of thoughts about how minor projects are defined; particularly that the numerical values seem to be a "one size fits all" approach, which may not be appropriate. He cited an example for number 4, which refers to 25% of the façade area. He said in a principal structure like Cardinal Health that wanted to increase the footprint by 10,000 square feet it would not have a great impact, but on a building that is only 10,000 square feet to begin it is a huge deal. He asked if there is any modification to that language that ought to be discussed.

Ms. Kramb confirmed it would be a percentage of an existing size. Mr. Hardt said percentages tend to be the right way to approach the topic, but he was not sure what those percentages should be.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked why we have to define them as a minor project. Mr. Goodwin said the list of all the projects that the ART has seen thus far have almost all been minor projects. He said from Planning's perspective, a significant number of them were truly minor in nature. He said Planning could to take another look at the list, but wouldn't want to remove the minor project entirely and have to have everything come through the basic plan review.

Mr. Hardt agreed and said some of the examples would not need to be reviewed by the Commission. He said however where the entire architectural appearance of a building is changing doesn't feel minor, such as Applebee's and KFC. Ms. Kramb agreed and questioned why KFC was not reviewed by the Commission.

Mr. Hardt asked what the criteria were that identified those two projects as a minor project. Mr. Goodwin said several criteria apply, but the main criteria are the Existing Structures provisions.

Ms. Amorose Groomes confirmed the site was rezoned into the Bridge Street District. Mr. Goodwin said yes, but the Code states these are Existing Structures as of the date of adoption of the Bridge Street District.

Ms. Kramb said she thought maybe it was Criterion 5 because there were exterior modifications. Mr. Goodwin said if those buildings had been built under the Bridge Street District and then Criteria 4 and 5 would apply.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said maybe 25% of any given façade, rather than 25% of the total building would be more appropriate.

Mr. Hardt asked if there was reason why Existing Structures could not be subjected to the same seven criteria above. Mr. Goodwin said not necessarily, but the intent with the Existing Structures within the Bridge Street District was the Code requirements do not necessarily apply. He said it was discussed as part of the original Code adoption and it could be further discussed with the building types section in terms of how to get Existing Structures into compliance over time. He said he felt the Code could be made stronger and eventually these structures would be in compliance with Code.

Mr. Hardt and Ms. Amorose Groomes thanked Mr. Goodwin for turning this text around and getting it out to the Commissioners.

Commission Roundtable

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were any further discussion topics.

Mr. Fishman commented about the Edwards project and expressed concerns about the scale of the completed project had it moved forward. He said he would like to know how the streets would look before they built the buildings. He said he also had the opportunity to see another Edwards project being built along I-270 with only 230 units and it is a giant building. He said to imagine how big the building would have been with over 300 units. Ms. Amorose Groomes added it also included structured parking.

Mr. Fishman said he was concerned about developing these residential projects without services to attract people to the area. He questioned why young professionals would want to move into this large residential building when there weren't the shops or restaurants around. He said that is why it is probably terribly important that we see the whole picture.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said they were successful in the Arena District because it was built near a variety of things to do that existed first and the residential followed.

Mr. Fishman said he misunderstood form based codes when it was first explained by the consultants. He said he thought we would see what a project was going to look like and then a developer would build it. He said that way we would not be shocked when a large building is built near petite shops and completely dwarfs it.

Mr. Taylor added the general direction we have heard is the development seems most imminent closer to Historic Dublin, which is probably the right direction.

Meeting was adjourned at 8:02 p.m.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on November 7, 2013.